

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS
EASTERN DIVISION**

MAUI JIM, INC., an Illinois Corporation,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	No. 16-cv-09788
)	
SMARTBUY GURU ENTERPRISES, a)	
Cayman Island Company, MOTION)	Judge Aspen
GLOBAL LTD., a Hong Kong Company,)	
SMARTBUYGLASSES SOCIETÀ A)	Magistrate Judge Gilbert
RESPONSABILITÀ LIMITATA, an Italian)	
company, SMARTBUYGLASSES)	
OPTICAL LIMITED, a Hong Kong)	
company,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

PLAINTIFF’S FEE PETITION

On March 19, 2018, the Court denied “Defendants’ Motion for Reconsideration of Supply–Chain Confidentiality Designation in Light of New Facts and for Expedited Discovery into Potential Contemptuous Conduct.” [126] In its Minute Entry, the Court provided that:

Defendants shall pay Plaintiff its attorneys’ fees and costs incurred in filing its Response [117] to Defendants’ Motion [113] in accordance with Rule 37(a)(5)(B). Defendants’ Motion [113] was not well–founded and it is possible that Plaintiff could have avoided responding to at least some of Defendants’ arguments if Defendants had complied with Local Rule 37.2 or Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 37(a)(1) before they filed the Motion. [126]

The Court directed the parties to see if they could reach agreement on the amount of fees and costs Plaintiff incurred in filing its Response and that if the parties could not agree, that Plaintiff shall file its fee petition by April 2, 2018. [126]

On March 27, 2018, Plaintiff's undersigned counsel informed Defendants' counsel that Plaintiff incurred \$18,649.50 in legal fees in filing its Response. (*Exh. A.*) Plaintiff's counsel included a summary breakdown supporting the amount, and asked for Defendants' position on the amount by March 29, 2018. (*Id.*) Defendants have not responded to date.

Plaintiff submits that the amount of fees reflected in the attached summary breakdown is reasonable and proper, particularly considering the Court's expedited briefing schedule on Defendants' underlying motion (five business days, *see* [116]) and the serious charges that Defendant leveled against undersigned counsel and their client.

Moreover, Plaintiff requests that the Court add the fees Plaintiff incurred in filing this fee Petition (including a Reply) and in trying to reach agreement with Defendant on the amount of fees to be paid under the Court's order. Neither would have been necessary without Defendant's ill-founded motion.

On April 2, 2018, undersigned counsel asked Defendants' counsel for a proposed date for Defendants' response to this Petition, in accordance with the Court's Minute Entry [126]. (*Exh. B.*) Defendants' counsel has not responded. Plaintiff proposes the following schedule: April 11, 2018, for Defendants' Response; and April 16, 2018, for Plaintiff's Reply.

Respectfully submitted,

Michelle M. Mikol
BARNES & THORNBURG LLP
1717 Pennsylvania Avenue NW
Suite 500
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 371-6356

/s/John Gabrielides
John T. Gabrielides
BARNES & THORNBURG LLP
One North Wacker Drive
Suite 4400
Chicago, IL 60606
(312) 357-1313

Attorneys for Plaintiff